



Complexity and youth mental health: Leading effective teams

<https://www.mhpn.org.au/podcasts>

Release date: Wednesday 15 April on Mental Health in Practice

Presenters: Radhika Santhanam-Martin, Clinical Psychologist
Aly Butchers, Manager of Legal Practice for the Family Violence Program at Youthlaw
Kate Raseta, National Manager of Strategic Initiatives at headspace National
Kirsten Meyer, Dramatherapist

Disclaimer: The following transcript has been autogenerated and may contain occasional errors or inaccuracies resulting from the automated transcription process.

Host (00:01):

Hi there. Welcome to Mental Health Professionals Network podcast series. MHPN's aim is to promote and celebrate interdisciplinary collaborative mental healthcare.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (00:18):

Hi, I'm Radhika Santhanam-Martin, and I'm the host of today's podcast presented by MHPN. In this episode, we'll be exploring the context and complexity of leading multidisciplinary teams in the youth mental health sector. By way of beginning, I'd like to introduce my guests. Welcome, Ali.

Aly Butchers (00:40):

Thanks, Radhika.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (00:41):

And Kate?

Kate Raseta (00:42):

Hi, Radhika.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (00:43):

And Kirsten.



Transcript

**Kirsten Meyer (00:44):**

Thanks, Radhika. Hi, Aly, and hi, Kate.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (00:47):

I want to briefly tease out two concepts before I open this up for discussion. The first is the notion of multidisciplinary teams. Because in healthcare, these are teams that integrate and coordinate diverse professionals. For example, doctors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, et cetera, art, drama therapists, and even beyond health, lawyers, community development workers, financial counsellors, youth workers. The reason why integrated practise programmes with multidisciplinary workforce emerged in the first place was to reduce the fragmentation of care, to improve client access and experiences, to better manage complex chronic intersectional needs, and to address wider social and environmental factors. What this really meant on the ground was practises of better communications, sharing of records and resources, linking of care pathways, and learning from each other's struggles and triumphs. So these integrated programmes were place-based.

(02:04):

What I mean by that is these programmes were embedded in communities where we live in and work with. The second notion that I want to just briefly touch upon is the notion of leadership. This term is a broad church. It includes informal leadership, formal leadership, or a combination. Informal leadership is when an individual takes on the role of leading, even when there is no demand or designation. The individual person's skills, influence, and trust within the group allows for them to take on the leadership role. Think of children's playground where one child assumes the role and the rest follow. Then there is the formal role of leading and leadership in the position description that is the person in this position is expected to lead. The reason I invited the three of you, Ali, Kate and Kirsten, is because I felt that you bring the formal and informal notions of leadership together in a really beautiful way in your work.

(03:18):

So without further delay, let's begin. How long have you been in leadership roles and what are some of your personal reflections on leading a multidisciplinary team? Can I start with you, Ali?

Aly Butchers (03:32):

So I've been a senior lawyer for around four years, and that does involve supervision and some leading and the like within the team. And then I've been in a more formal manager role for coming up on a year. So I work at a community legal centre where lawyers are working alongside social workers. So there is a bit of collaboration, well, quite a lot of collaboration in that sense as well. So my reflection is that it's a privilege. I've had jobs before in this space where I have not been in a multidisciplinary team and not really had anyone even remotely at hand, I guess, to call on. And I really do think it's the gold standard for working with young people and probably many marginalised groups in the communities. And we've all studied and trained for various periods in our professions, and I think it can only benefit your own practise to learn about another discipline. So I love it.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (04:16):



Transcript



And is it common in the legal sector, Ali, to have this kind of integration outside of lawyers? Is it common to have hybrid professionals coming together?

Aly Butchers (04:28):

Increasingly so. So there's quite a lot of other professions that are coming in like financial counsellors and the like into the sort of community legal space, which is really important, but they all operate a little bit differently. So some of them are quite siloed in the way that they work. The way we work at the centre I'm at is that we are really integrated. So as much as possible, it is the lawyer and the social worker doing almost everything together. So I think that way of practising is unique, although there's certainly other centres that are sort of starting to operate a little bit more that way, having seen the benefit.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (04:56):

Lovely. Kirsten?

Kirsten Meyer (04:57):

Thanks Radhika. So in Australia, because I am from South Africa, I've been in formal leadership roles for the last six years, both in family violence, leading a team of creative arts therapists, an organisation that responds to family violence, but my programme was in the kind of more healing space. I met more recently in a violence prevention space, but always with young people and children at the centre. And I guess just thinking about what this means, I guess I value plurality and I guess I value that we all have multiple identities as do our clients. So I'm very interested in multiple ways of knowing, recognising that there are many knowledge systems in the world. So I guess on one hand, a team made up of multiple disciplines feels really important and very rich, and there's lots of strength in that. And on the other hand, I think sometimes putting it into practise has quite a lot of challenges, especially when I think the child and young person is at the centre and is our client.

(05:57):

And this is more working across teams within my organisation and across other services, how you laid that out at the beginning. But I think often the professionalisation of our disciplines, certainly my experience has led to quite a lot of siloing and actually fragmentation. And so often we're very focused on fixing and everybody brings their expert knowledge and our way of working and the country in which we work, the Western kind of context really privileges the expert. And often I found that's quite difficult to really hear from everyone and the young person's voice is often silenced within that.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (06:32):

Kirsten, listening to you, I was reminded of so many things, and particularly when you said plurality and different ways of knowing, because what I'm reminded is, at least in Australia, the history of integrated programmes started with only Aboriginal and Islander populations. It was called ITC, Integrated Treatment Care. And for some reason, it took so long to bring it to the mainstream. And I remember reading the indigenous caller, Karen Martin, writing an extraordinary piece from a public health lens saying the ways of knowing, doing and being has to be cross-fertilized. Very, very interesting. Thank you for reminding us of this plurality. Kate?



Transcript

**Kate Raseta (07:18):**

Hi Radhika. In terms of leadership roles, I've sort of been in and out of leadership roles over the last 10 years. I've worked in the youth mental health sector for six years. And prior to that, I was working in international development, so working with teams based in the Pacific and Southeast Asia. So I guess the connecting thread for a lot of my work is trying to centre the perspectives and lived experience of those whose programmes you're aiming to support. And for my work in youth mental health, I don't work in service delivery. I work managing programmes that support the teams that are delivering services. So that involves working with subject matter experts and academics, clinical advisors, lived experience, project managers, and advocacy and policy specialists. So that's my area of multidisciplinary teamwork. And like with Aly and Kirsten, when it works, it's the best thing ever.

(08:18):

I think that the challenge in managing teams is to ensure that everybody really understands their role, what they bring, and that they feel valued for what they bring to the work.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (08:29):

Kate, one of the things I want to ask you is, because your role is pretty distinct, as in you are policy facing, whereas the other two leadership roles are client facing. And in the policy facing, Kate, what you're saying to us is that to centre lived experience voices and subject matter experts as in the lived experience too. Is that kind of a new frontier, do you think? Can you tell us more?

Kate Raseta (08:56):

I'm reflecting on my work in the aid programme, which often those modalities can feel not great and quite clunky when you have Australia-based aid specialists coming into countries. And in the past, it has felt often like you're imposing ways of working on communities who know what they need better than anyone. So the way that I've always tried to work is to listen more than impose anything. And that's not always easy in the speed of programme delivery and in the hierarchies of teams. But I've learned a lot from First Nations colleagues at my workplace and an incredible First Nations leader that came in a few years ago had two very firm principles that she worked on. And that is that our work is always relational, not transactional, and that we work at the speed of trust. And I've carried those two with me to inform any work that I do in teams.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (09:58):

I'm just going to highlight this to relational, not transactional, and we work at the speed of trust. Amazing. Thank you to the elder. I want to go on to the next one, and that nicely segues into what you've just said, Kate, which is often I'm sure as team leaders, but also as leaders in your service, you hear the phrase, "It is too complex." You hear it from referral sources, you hear it from services, you hear it in case conferences, in clinical and legal meetings. So this phrase has come to mean many things. So I want to ask all three of you, how do you understand this phrase, it's too complex, and how do you navigate that space? Kirsten, could you begin?

Kirsten Meyer (10:46):



Transcript



Sure, Radhika. I could talk about this forever, but I'll begin by saying, I don't know what that means other than we are all complex. So when people say that, I'm kind of thinking, but isn't that the definition of what it means to be human? Isn't this what we are? And life is complex, and I think we're living in increasingly complex times. So I think for me, I sometimes wonder, does that mean this is just too difficult to understand? And I actually don't want to understand or I can't understand. Certainly in where I've worked, the systems and needing to plug young people in, fix them, find solutions, evidence-based, which of course there's a place for, but there's also something about measuring, efficiency, and we really lose the relationship and we lose being able to listen to what's really happening for the young person within their sociopolitical kind of context.

(11:41):

I think it's just become a term for, this is just too hard to understand. And also saying that I think the systems within which we work want simplicity and I think they're very complicated. And I think it puts a lot on the practitioner. You get a referral in with multiple different kind of complexities in the child's life. And multiple individual practitioners have said, "We can't work with this child, just too complex." We get the referral and you look at it on paper and you think, "Who would ever work with us?" Until the child walks in the room and you start to understand who they are, the family context, the cultural, the social, the political, and to try and kind of hold all of that and work with young people demands work, it demands scaffolding, it demands resources and it demands huge effort and investment.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (12:30):

Thank you. Aly, where do you want to take that?

Aly Butchers (12:34):

I feel similar to Kirsten. I could probably talk about it all day as well in a slightly different way with a legal lens, but probably exactly many of the same frustrations and observations. So I think for us, we're a little bit different in that we get to see, we'll probably work through some of the complexity in a pretty confronting way just by the virtue of the clients we have. So often our young people are getting referred to us at court. So we're at court on the day, for a criminal matter, you've got a family violence matter. We have to go through it with you and give you advice. So we don't really have the opportunity to build that relationship in any kind of slow way. It's sometimes not the most trauma informed way. We obviously do our best, but it's just the nature of the work we do.

(13:11):

So it is confronting for the young person, but equally they're at court. I think they kind of understand that it's serious and we need to talk about some of this stuff. But the benefit is that we often, we've got a timeline of when certain things have gone on and we do get to have that information put to us quite early on. And so the benefit for our social workers is that they can sort of weed, I guess, through some of these complexities straight out of the gate. So it is still complex for us for sure, but I think the real frustration in terms of it's too complex and how it confronts us and our work is when we do try and make those referrals and they're getting knocked back from services for various reasons. And that's really, really tough because the messaging that sends to the young person is, yeah, no one wants to help me, no one wants to work with me.



Transcript



(13:52):

And if these people can't even get me referred into somewhere, then what does that mean? So the optics of it from a young person's perspective are really tough and the implications it can have on their legal matter. They can be criticised for not being engaged with supports. And sometimes it's actually not through any fault of their own. And we also see beyond mental health, there'll be housing services and things. And so there really is just a range of services that can say no for a range of reasons. And it's incredibly frustrating. And like I said, I really feel for the young people in terms of the messaging that that sends to them, it's a massive problem. And then by the time they do get a referral in, I mean, the file is incentivized when they know they've been refused services for various reasons. So the two complex answer is incredibly frustrating for us in terms of lawyers and social workers at the legal centre I work at because time's a bit more of the essence.

(14:38):

We've got court dates and the like, but yeah, I'm sure incredibly frustrating and disheartening for the young people themselves as well.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (14:44):

That really is in some ways is the underpinning of this, isn't it, Aly. When you're saying when the young person hears this is too difficult, they actually hear you are too difficult. They don't hear the problem. So that's so important what you're saying. Kate, how do you navigate the space, particularly from the policy lens?

Kate Raseta (15:09):

I really like the way both Aly and Kirsten have described complexity. I asked my partner what it meant to him. He works at the very pointy end of family reunification work. And he said he always goes into it remembering that you're working with people who have a lot going on. It's not any more complicated than that. And I think we create barriers and silos with this term complexity. And as Aly said, we do end up really stigmatising the young people that we work with when we label them as complex. In terms of policy work and in terms of running programmes to support those who are working with, inverted comma, as complex young people, I think it's really important to have an understanding of your place in the system and what you can influence. And sometimes that might be something quite small in terms of policy, there are so many different things impacting young people at the moment.

(16:04):

We keep hearing from our service providers that the young people coming in are increasingly complex. That's not a surprise. They're living really difficult in many ways times. So rather than trying to tackle it as a whole, if we can look at small things and work on impacting around policy in that way. And in my work, the thing for the last couple of years that we've heard so loud and clear from young people is that the cost of living is absolutely impacting every part of their lives, their sense of wellbeing, their feelings about the future, their ability to get an education, find work. If from a policy perspective, you can really just single in one issue that speaks to a whole lot of different issues, I think that can be effective.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (16:52):



Transcript



Amazing. Because one of the things then that means is that policy should be careful not to dumb it down and not to have the courage to layer it and to deepen it, even if it's one issue. How interesting. Look, I want to go to another kind of strand in integrated programmes and multidisciplinary professionals and leadership, and that is around rupture and repair. Now, these are concepts that are usually discussed in therapeutic rooms. How do you think in multidisciplinary teams you can manage ruptures and repairs, especially given the fact that the ripple effect of such a conflict ultimately, eventually, inadvertently or intentionally impact on client and family outcomes. So in your opinion, how should teams manage relational repair across team members? And could you share a story around this dilemma? Aly, could I ask you first to respond?

Aly Butchers (17:53):

I think the biggest and most frequent one that crops up for us in the legal space is being lawyers. We've got the protection of legal privilege. So there's virtually no information we would ever go and share without the consent of our client. The exceptions to that are only in pretty extreme circumstances. We think they're an immediate danger of someone else and that sort of thing. Working alongside social workers, although we're not mandatory reporters at our workspace, they've got their own ethics as a profession. And often what we will sit with as lawyers and not break privilege over puts them in a really difficult space in terms of what they're sitting with. And ultimately, we're a legal service. And so if we have to consider it from breaking the legal privilege standpoint, which is a really, really high bar, but we always make it really clear to our social workers that we want to know.

(18:37):

We don't want people going home or considering breaking privilege, even though they're not lawyers as a service breaking privilege because they're sitting so uncomfortably in terms of their ethics framework that their profession operates from. So that's probably the biggest rupture that we have in our team and it does crop up relatively regularly. So there's quite a few robust conversations, but it's something we are very cognisant of from the outset. It's something we talk about when we first meet with clients and start to be a little bit forward thinking in terms of what we think they might disclose. And perhaps we do try and work together as much as we can, but perhaps there is a space where we can carve off where there might be some things that I talk to the young person about away from the social worker. So we try and preempt, but yeah, if something does come up and we haven't had it on our radar, and often these things are quite urgent, it does, as I said, create some robust conversations.

(19:26):

So it is difficult, but the transparency that we have in terms of how it's managed, we're constantly reassessing our framework. It's very much equal input. We don't have a hierarchal structure when it's like, well, the lawyers will trump the social workers. Obviously as an organisation, we need to say, "Well, this is our organisation as a legal service." But it's really not from this space of us as professionals saying we've got power over you as a social worker. So it's something we work really hard on. I think it's always going to be tension with these two professions working with each other. So we just kind of invite it, and I know I'm making it sound really optimistic, but that is honestly what we do. Have a tough day of conversations, take a breather and we come back, work out where the frustrations really were, and we've managed to work them all out.

(20:07):



Nice. Kirsten?

Kirsten Meyer (20:09):

Thanks, Radhika. Yeah, I think, as you said, ruptures and repairs happen all the time. And I really think as a leader of a team that we really have to attend to them. I mean, ruptures happen in families, they happen in therapeutic relationships, they happen across teams and organisations. Sometimes you come feed into that idea of it's too complex, but I think we have to lean into it because I think unless we're attending to what's happening in the relationship between people in a team and in my programme, certainly between all the different kind of professionals working and how we understand who that young person is. And sometimes the work in family violence too reflects and starts to show up in ways in which we start relating with each other. And I think for me, certainly working in that family violence space was really working very hard on my own supervision to also step back and to notice it's so easy to get pulled into the drama of it all.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (21:01):

That's such a parallel process that can happen, isn't it?

Kirsten Meyer (21:05):

Correct. So for me and my team, I think I drove my team nutty because I'd say, "We need to talk." We need to come together. And I also then would use, because that's my background, I would use other ways of trying to understand and knowing. So some projective techniques, I might use objects, I might use an image making where we could do and we could create around how we might be feeling or what might be happening, step back and then hopefully think and discuss. It sounds easy. It's not easy. I think it's ongoing work, but I think you can never become complacent.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (21:38):

No, thank you. That's wonderful. Kate, how do you navigate this from a policy angle? Because it's not just about the policy angle, it's also the idealism and the egos that come in. Tell us.

Kate Raseta (21:52):

There's also, as Kirsten or Aly also alluded to, there's hierarchies within organisations. And I'm in an organisation where clinical expertise is considered, for good reason, a very strong voice in every room. So when you're working with teams where there's clinical expertise, lived experience and all sorts of other expertise, there's sometimes tension around managing those hierarchies. I think it's important to normalise that it's good to have friction if it's intellectual friction and not interpersonal friction. And two of the teams that I worked with recently came together for some facilitated discussions that really dug into that and explored what those two things look and feel like. Aly, you were going to say something?

Aly Butchers (22:36):

I was just going to say that ego is probably a big ... We've had other services approach us and said, "Well, how do you do it?" And ask questions because they're thinking of doing it. And it's something that always comes out, well, how do your lawyers find working with social workers? And I hate that



Transcript



question because it's just so inappropriate. And I think it just speaks to me that people just sort of instantly, oh, I can't even find the words. It's going to be professional to say on a podcast. But I really just think, and I often wonder, so if you're worried about yourself being like that, a lot of our organisations don't have those sort of values at the core. And so I really think it probably speaks to a bigger organisational problem if that's a frequent concern. It's like honestly, one of the first questions other legal services will ask.

(23:13):

And as you're saying, I think if it's an intellectual, robust discussion based on intellectual concepts and issues and tensions, and that's one thing, but ego's coming into it, I think that's probably the biggest thing that'll just upset it all and really frustrate the work, like you were saying, you do Kirsten.

Kate Raseta (23:28):

Yeah. And it takes much longer to repair when there's people who feel like their core has been disrespected or insulted.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (23:35):

Thank you, Kate. Thank you also for introducing us and the audience to this beautiful framing of intellectual friction versus interpersonal friction. I want to go to the next theme. What does child-led or youth-centered mean? Whether it's in the service framework or in a programme or policy framework, is there a gap in the rhetoric between what is said and what is done? And is there also a gap in terms of knowledge and skills in this area or both? Kate, do you want to briefly respond to this?

Kate Raseta (24:09):

I definitely think there are gaps, but I want to lift it a bit higher. I feel like the real gap is often in our culture in respect beyond people. I remember when I was a kid, there was often graffiti when there was new concrete, and there was this piece of graffiti in our street that said, "Teenagers are dumb." And my brothers and I were little and we used to look at it and just feel like scared to become a young person, scared to become a teenager. And when I had kids, the same thing happened, or "enjoy them now because when they're teenagers, they'll hate you or they'll be so difficult". I just think there's this terrible narrative around young people in our culture that really impacts on the work that we do with young people. So I feel really lucky to work in an organisation where I'm surrounded by people who genuinely love, respect, and want the best for young people.

(25:08):

And I think that's what makes the biggest difference, not the knowledge or skills base. It's the attitude and the respect for all of the incredible strengths that young people have. That's

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (25:21):

That's profound Kate. Kirsten, what would you like to add to that?

Kirsten Meyer (25:25):



Transcript



Yes, that is profound to listen to, to really listen to and to centre what a child or a young person has to say and what their experiences are. Certainly, in my experience, very much within the kind of child protection, kind of risk protective, and there's a role for that. And I think at the same time, sometimes it's silences. It silences young people and children. We need to listen to them and we need to also recognise that this is the child's behaviour. The school sees it in this way. A psychotherapist might see it in that way. The youth justice might see it in another way, but really kind of trying to understand just all of what's caused those behaviours and really not pathologize the child and also acknowledge that often behaviours are real strong survival resistances and adaptations to what's happened to them.

(26:21):

And I think that that's such a thing I think we miss because I think we get too scared and we also don't recognise and respect that they have their own agency, young people and children. They do actually have voice. And I think we've created spaces for that. It does mean there's more kind of complexity hold, but we don't know.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (26:40):

Beautiful. And from your angle, Aly?

Aly Butchers (26:44):

Completely agree with everything Kate and Kirsten have just said as well. Different jurisdictions are a little bit different, but for the predominant space that I work, I mean, young people can instruct their own lawyer from 10, and that's often pretty confronting, particularly for parents or guardians to learn. And they're my client. They're who give me my instructions. It's not a parent. Their influence can't come into it. So we really have that defined role and I work for them effectively. So that's how I work with them and that makes it easier a little bit in that our service again operates in that way. And Kate said, "I really feel very lucky for a service." That's our focus. It's just assumed that that's how we operate. But then facing how that interacts in that way that we work with some of the other services is a really, really difficult tension that we have as well because like Kirsten's saying, so often they've been silenced or there's different layers of people who've spoken for them or interpreted their experiences.

(27:34):

And it's all, hang on, what this worker is saying has gone on is actually very different to what this young person's sitting here describing to me and they've got so many strengths and their behaviours are really there for a reason. And if you actually immerse yourself and their world and what they're saying has gone on, it makes total sense. But there's so many people that have come into it, parents have had influence. And this professional's referred to this professional, and we get so far away from their actual experience and where they're coming from. And it's such a loss. And they know. They know everyone's spoken to each other and they feel like their voice doesn't matter because something else has gone and happened, which was different to what they tried to advocate for themselves. And I think it just encourages that silence because no one's going to listen to me.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (28:15):



Thank you. I'm going to wrap it up with the very last question, which is a very practical question because this one that we answered is for me much more their sense of this topic as to what does youth centred mean. But the very last one we are going to wrap it up with is what tools could help design integrated practise programmes in a way that enhances leadership and multidisciplinary teams? Just if you could give one tool as a recommendation. Kate, can I start with you?

Kate Raseta (28:43):

I know that we were trying to lean into the AI discussion with this one, but Radhika, I'm the worst person to ask. So I've got a lot of project management in my background and I tend to really lean on project management tools. And often that's just about giving everybody a sense of structure and a sense of knowing what their role is. But it's also a great way of constantly as a team coming back to the purpose of the work that you're doing. A project has an objective or a strategy has a mission statement. And that is the most important tool for me to keep everybody constantly reminded of what the purpose of the work is.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (29:24):

Lovely. Aly?

Aly Butchers (29:25):

I think probably the one word would be purpose. Like Kate saying, what's the purpose of the work that you're doing? But I think also purpose of role. I think what is each person bringing and having a really clear understanding of what everyone's contributing because there is overlap, but I think if we can all feel like we have a valid space in the room of a team and that other people in that room, that team understand that we bring purpose and what our role is, I think that can only help everyone be more collaborative and more respectful and more functional.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (29:53):

Wow. Kirsten?

Kirsten Meyer (29:55):

This is probably not a tool, but it's more of a thinking tool. How do we stay intentional, how do we really think and how do we think critically? But always with the child and the young person at the centre. And how do we do that? Do we even need something physically in the room just to represent the child? Because so often we go woof into our adult spaces. It's a bit vague that, Radhika, I would love to see, going back to what you said at the beginning, place-based spaces and communities that don't look like clinics. Everyone is to kind of have a wraparound scaffolding support for young people and their families.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (30:31):

Wonderful. They are all profound insights like the purpose, the intention, the critical reflection, the place-based. I think we could talk about this the whole day, but we need to finish up. So thanks for tuning into today's episode, Brought to You by MHPN, where we explored the context and complexity of



Transcript



leading multidisciplinary teams in the youth mental health sector. You've been listening to me, Radhika Santhanam-Martin and ...

Kirsten Meyer (30:59):

Kirsten Mayer.

Kate Raseta (31:00):

Kate Raseta.

Aly Butchers (31:01):

and Aly Butchers.

Radhika Santhanam-Martin (31:02):

We've covered a lot in this terrain and explored the challenges and strengths of integrated practise programmes, but also the strengths and insights that young people themselves bring to the sector. If you want to learn more about me and my guests or the resources we have mentioned, go to the episode's landing page and follow the hyperlinks. We'd love to hear what you thought of this episode. On the landing page, you'll find a link to a feedback survey.

(31:31):

Please fill out the survey and let us know whether you got what you needed from the conversation and provide comments and suggestions about how MHPN might better meet your listening needs. Thank you for your commitment to multidisciplinary care and lifelong learning.

Host (31:48):

Visit mhpn.org.au to find out more about our online professional programme, including podcasts, webinars, as well as our face-to-face interdisciplinary mental health networks across Australia.

